7751 b90 From the Author

John Jebb

OBSERVATIONS

ON

SUBSCRIPTION

TO THE

THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

BRITISH MUSEUM

OBSERVATIONS

UPON AN

ESSAY ON THE NATURE AND IMPORT

OF

SUBSCRIPTION

TO THE

THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

IN

IRELAND.

BY

WILLIAM HALES, D. D.

RECTOR OF KILLESANDRA.

FORMERLY

FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE,

AND

PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES

IN THE

UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY AND FOR R. E. MERCIER AND CO. NO. 31

ANGLESEA-STREET

1800.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO THE

HON. AND RIGHT REVEREND

CHARLES BRODRICK, D. D.

LORD BISHOP OF KILMORE;

THESE

OBSERVATIONS,

PUBLISHED BY HIS DESIRE,

ARE

RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

BY

HIS FAITHFUL FRIEND,

AND

MOST OBEDIENT SERVANT,

WILLIAM HALES.

BRITISH MUSEUM

OBSERVATIONS, &c.

Felices ter et amplius,
Quos irrupta tenet Copula.

HOR.

THE queſtion of Subſcription to the *Thirty nine Articles of Religion*, by the Clergy at ordination, has long been agitated in ENGLAND, and warmly and acutely diſcuſſed by the ableſt writers and beſt Divines: Some, ſtrenuouſly maintain its fitneſs, as indiſpenſibly requiſite to enſure *unity of Opinion* in the Members of the eſtabliſhed Church, and to

exclude Diſſenters; others, no leſs ſtrenuouſly aſſert their unfitneſs, as controuling the indefeaſible right of *Private Judgment* in matters of Religion, and impoſing an intolerable yoke and burthen on tender or ſcrupulous Conſciences; while the more moderate, ſteer a middle courſe, and though they hold the expediency of a *Symbol of Faith* among thoſe of the ſame communion, yet recommend a cautious reviſion and a temperate reform of ſuch articles as are eſteemed exceptionable, either in the matter or expreſſion.

In IRELAND, the queſtion has long lain dormant:——It has however been rouſed at length by a learned and reſpectable Dignitary of the *Iriſh* Church, the Reverend Doctor *Stokes*;—and what may appear to add greater weight and authority to his Sentiments,—Chaplain to our late and much regretted Primate, Archbiſhop *Newcome*, to whom he has dedicated his *Eſſay on the Nature and import of the* 39 *Articles* in IRELAND, printed indeed, as appears from the title page, in 1799; though not perhaps circulated until 1800, *after* the Primate's death; and which therefore, I confeſs, does not weigh with *me* as unequivocal evidence of his Grace's

Grace's entire approbation of the ſentiments and poſitions contained therein.

Whatever reſpect I may owe to the opinion of an Old Friend and Brother; both, Members of the ſame venerable Seminary of Learning, and embarked in the ſame cauſe, as fellow Labourers in the Sacred Vineyard; yet when that opinion ſeems rather to militate againſt the acknowledged *Unity* of the Eſtabliſhed Churches of ENGLAND and IRELAND in Articles of *Faith* and *Diſcipline*; and perhaps tends "*to remove the Landmarks*" by ſuppoſing an *eſſential* difference in their Conſtitutions, founded on grounds which on examination, to me at leaſt, appear to be inſufficient, and untenable in their full extent: However undeſirable or ill timed any Controverſy about the *Outworks* of Religion may be judged by the beſt and wiſeſt pillars of our Common Church, at an awful and eventful period, when the *Citadel* itſelf is aſſailed by foes of every deſcription; and *Religious Eſtabliſhments* every "where *unſettled*" or tottering throughout *Chriſtendom*;—(ſo tremendouſly characteriſtic of that diſaſtrous ſeaſon of "*wars* and *unſettlements*" Luke xxi. 9. deſtined to precede the ſecond Advent of JESUS CHRIST in Glory, to *eſtabliſh*, *the Kingdom* of THE

GOD OF HEAVEN *upon Earth*, *Dan.* vii. 14. *Matt.* vi. 10.) when on the contrary, the moſt learned and the moſt virtuous citizens, are loudly and imperiouſly called on, at this preſſing hour, to rally round the Sacred Standard of the GOD OF ORDER; and all parties, ſects and denominations of Chriſtians, forgetting their feuds, and jealouſies, to unite "with one heart and with one ſoul" againſt the Common Foe: Although the expediency may juſtly be queſtioned of mooting *Speculative* points, ſo long at reſt, and of hazarding a *Schiſm* between the two Churches, at this moſt awful Criſis, when the public mind is already too much diſtracted and diſturbed by the momentuous meaſure of *Legiſlative Union*, now depending; yet, I humbly conceive, there can be no impropriety in offering a few obſervations to the BROTHERHOOD, rather as motives of *peace* than of *controverſy*; equally wiſhing to eſtabliſh and build the indefeaſible right of *Private Judgment*, as to the interpretation of all Laws and Ordinances, Divine and Human, (for which we both contend alike) on a firmer, a broader, and a more durable Baſis.

Doctor *Stokes's* argument to prove the *diſtinctneſs* of the Conſtitutions of the Eſtabliſhed Churches

of

of ENGLAND and IRELAND, is ſummed up under the following heads: p. 7.

1. "The ENGLISH STATUTE, the ENGLISH CANON have HERE no force."

2. "WE have NO STATUTE requiring *ſubſcription to the Articles*, except in two very particular Caſes: viz. the Caſes of *Heads of Colleges* and *Lecturers*."

3. "WE have NO CANON requiring *declaration* of *unfeigned aſſent to every one of them, as agreeable to the Laws of* GOD."

4. "The *Title* of them as it is introduced into OUR ECCLESIASTICAL LAW, is not a declaration of the Lawgivers *intention*, but a formal deſignation of the *object* concerning which the Law treats."

5. And hence he concludes: that WE received the THIRTY NINE ARTICLES, merely as *Articles of peace*, not as *Articles of Faith* or *Opinion*.—"OUR LAWS," ſays he, "*have*," in Biſhop *Bramhall's* phraſe,

phraſe, " *Mens practices, not their opinions, for their object.*" p. 31.

I ſhall conſider each of theſe Heads in order.

I. The firſt is granted, that ENGLISH STATUTES or CANONS, merely as ſuch, have no force in IRELAND hitherto.

The ſecond alſo I admit, that Subſcription to the Thirty Nine Articles is not enjoined by any IRISH Statute, (except in two caſes) whereas in ENGLAND it is enjoined by the ſtatute of 13 Eliz. c. 12. " requiring that every perſon to be *ordained*, and every Clergyman to be capable of a *benefice* ſhall *read the Articles*, with *a declaration of his unfeigned aſſent* "

The third is *Logically* true; for WE have no CANON, in the Words of the 36th ENGLISH CANON of 1603, *formally* requiring the Clergy to *ſubſcribe* " *willingly*," and " *ex animo*;" and " *to acknowledge all and every of the Articles, to be agreeable to the Word of God.*"

But I apprehend, the ſum and ſubſtance of this ENGLISH CANON, is *virtually* contained in the 32nd CANON of the Church of IRELAND:

—— " Neither

—— "Neither ſhall *any perſon* be received into the *Miniſtry*, nor admitted to any *Eccleſiaſtical Living*, nor permitted to preach, read, lecture, catechiſe or miniſter the Sacrament, except he ſhall firſt by *ſubſcription* declare his *conſent* to the *firſt four Canons* of this preſent Synod [holden in Dublin A. D. 1634] and *every thing contained therein.*"

And this IRISH CANON I conſider as fully tantamount to the ENGLISH ACT of 13 Eliz. c. 12. preſcribing "*unfeigned aſſent*" to the 39 *Articles:* eſpecially when compared with the *Firſt Iriſh Canon* to which it refers: "*For eſtabliſhing the Agreement of the Church of* ENGLAND and IRELAND *in the Profeſſion of the ſame* FAITH,"—and which is as follows: "For the Manifeſtation of OUR *Agreement* with the Church of ENGLAND, in the *confeſſion* of the ſame FAITH, and THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, WE do *receive* and *approve* the Book of ARTICLES OF RELIGION, agreed upon by the Archbiſhops and Biſhops and the whole Clergy in the *Convocation* holden at LONDON in the year of OUR LORD GOD, 1562;—For the avoiding of *Diverſities of Opinions*, and for the eſtabliſhing of *Conſent* touching *true Religion*:—And therefore, if any ſhall hereafter affirm, that *any* of THESE [39] ARTICLES,

are

are in *any part*, *ſuperſtitious* or *erroneous*; or ſuch, as he may not with *a good conſcience*, *ſubſcribe* unto, let him be excommunicated; and not *abſolved* before he make a public revocation of his error."

In the interpretation of this *firſt Canon*, Doctor *Stokes* introduces a nice and ſubtile diſtinction between the meaning of the terms ASSENT and CONSENT; "the former," ſays he, "in ſtrictneſs relating to *opinions* or *aſſertions*, as an act of the *judgment*; the latter to ſomething *done* or *to be done*, as an act of the *Will*," p. 14. And unqueſtionably, the authorities he adduces from our licenſed Tranſlation of the Bible, Acts xxi. 9. and viii. 1. and Biſhop *Bramhall*, whom he repreſents as the framer of that article, fully juſtify the diſcrimination.

But he candidly admits that in common acceptation, the terms *aſſent* and *conſent* are uſed promiſcuouſly; and that even *Johnſon*, in his excellent Dictionary, has not ſtated the different meaning of theſe words as critically as he thinks (and I too) he *ought* to have done." And as this is the Hinge, on which his whole argument turns, let us endeavour to aſcertain, 1. The *ſenſe* in which it is uſed in the Firſt Canon; and 2. the *intention* of the Framer.

II. It

II. It is evident then, that the meaning of the word *conſent* in the thirty-ſecond Canon, is to be determined by its uſe in the Firſt Canon: But in the Firſt Canon, it is obviouſly contraſted with "*diverſities of Opinions*:" and muſt conſequently denote *agreement in opinions*, or concurrence in ſentiment, reſpecting the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF RELIGION, common to both Churches.

And it further appears, that the word *conſent* neceſſarily includes *aſſent* of the judgment to the 39 Articles, as Articles of *Faith* or *Opinion*, ſo as to be held neither "*ſuperſtitious*" nor "*erroneous*," in any part;—terms which plainly relate to the validity of the DOCTRINES contained therein, and required previouſly to *ordination*.

And as the FIRST CANON preſcribes, and "eſtabliſhes *Conſent* touching *true Religion*," "for the avoiding *diverſities of Opinions*;"—So the SECOND CANON eſtabliſhes "the maintenance of the *King's Supremacy in Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical*."

"All Eccleſiaſtical perſons having *cure of Souls*, and all other *Preachers* and *Readers of Divinity Lectures*, ſhall to the utmoſt of their wit, knowledge

and learning, *purely and ſincerely, (without any colour or diſſimulation)* teach manifeſt and declare, four times every year at the leaſt, in their Sermons and other Collations and Lectures, that *all uſurped and foreign power* (foraſmuch as the ſame hath no eſtabliſhment nor ground by the Law of God) is for moſt juſt cauſes taken away and aboliſhed, &c.——— And whoſoever ſhall *hereafter maintain* that *the King* hath not the ſame Authority in Cauſes eccleſiaſtical, that the godly Kings had among the *Jews*, and Chriſtian Emperors in the *primitive Church*; or [ſhall] impeach in any part his *regal Supremacy* in the ſaid Cauſes, *reſtored* to the Crown, and by the Laws of this Realm, therein *eſtabliſhed*, let him be *excommunicated*; and not *reſtored*, but only by the Archbiſhop of the Province, after his *repentance* and *public revocation* of his Error."

The THIRD CANON eſtabliſhes "*the Preſcript form of divine Service contained in the Book of Common Prayer.*"

The FOURTH CANON, preſcribes "*the form of conſecrating and ordering Archbiſhops, Biſhops, &c.* with an admiſſion, that "*the Churches eſtabliſhed under this Government, are* TRUE CHURCHES."—And both

both of theſe, are ſanctioned by the ſame penalty to be inflicted on every Recuſant:

"Let him be *excommunicated*, and not *reſtored*, until he *repent*, and publicly *revoke* his error."

And here we may remark a diſtinction between the penalty to be inflicted for the violation of the firſt Canon, and the violation of the reſt:——

The penalty of *Excommunication*, preſcribed in all the four, is, in the three laſt, accompanied with *deprivation*, as plainly intimated in "*the reſtoration*" of penitent offenders; whereas their *abſolution*, only from an error in judgment, is required by the Firſt Canon; The firſt, being applicable to "*Perſons to be received into the Miniſtry*" at their ordination; the reſt, to perſons licenſed to *preach, read, lecture, catechiſe or miniſter the Sacrament*" by ſome ſpecial appointment in the Church, as *Curates, Preachers, Readers, Lecturers*, &c. and who juſtly therefore, beſides excommunication, for Errors of *Faith*, incur deprivation for breach of *Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline*.

Now if *all theſe*, ſpecified in the three laſt Canons, are bound, by their Subſcription, "to the

utmoſt of their *wit*, *knowledge* and *learning*, *purely and ſincerely*, *without any colour or diſſimulation*, *to teach*, *manifeſt and declare*, the doctrines and duties preſcribed therein; is it to be imagined, that they who ſubſcribe to the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, (as required by the joint import of the thirty-ſecond and firſt Canons) are not *equally* bound *in conſcience* with the *Engliſh* Clergy—(by the thirty-ſixth Canon of 1603) to ſubſcribe *willingly*" and "*ex animo?*" and to *acknowledge all and every of the Articles to be agreeable to the Word of God*" as a previous requiſite to *ordination?* a condition required of the Engliſh Clergy by the Statute of 13 Eliz. c. 12, who are bound to read the Articles with a declaration of "*unfeigned Aſſent*;" (implied here, *virtually*, in the word "*conſent*" according to common Uſage—and the obvious interpretation of the firſt *Iriſh* Canon) in order to be capable of holding a *Benefice*, &c.?

As a *ſubſcriber* therefore *myſelf*, to the FOUR FIRST CANONS, and conſequently to THE ARTICLES; and as "an honeſt and a thinking man," endeavouring to the beſt of my ſkill and judgment—"*ſo* to expound one Canon of the Church, that it be not *repugnant* to another"—According to that Golden

Canon

Canon of comparative Criticiſm, inculcated in the 20th ARTICLE OF RELIGION; and according to the ſame rigorous rules of *ſpecial pleading*, for interpreting the conſtruction of *Acts of the Legiſlature*, preſcribed and inſiſted on in *Temporal* Courts of Judicature; I am reluctantly compelled to expreſs and declare my *diſſent*, from the foregoing poſition of Doctor *Stokes*; and alſo from the following general ſummary of his Argument: p. 26.

" The *conſent* then required to the FOUR FIRST CANONS ſeems to amount to a declaration and promiſe, of which this is the ſum:

I conſider the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, *the King's Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy*, the *Liturgy*, and the *Forms of Ordinations*, as Matters which, by *law* and for the ſake of concord, *ought not to be publicly impugned or ſpoken againſt*; and I promiſe that I will conform to the FOUR FIRST CANONS in not impugning them; ſpeaking, *writing* or preaching againſt them; by *maintaining* the *King's Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy*; and uſing, or concurring in, or conſenting to the *uſe* (as duty or occaſion may require) *of the preſcript forms of public Worſhip and Ordinations, and of no other in their ſtead.*"

In

In this explanation, the term "*conſent*" is plainly applied by Doctor *Stokes* himſelf to the *Thirty-nine Articles*, and muſt therefore include *aſſent* to *Opinions*; but how is this conſiſtent with his reſtriction of the term to the ſenſe of *ſimple acquieſcence*?—Or merely *not impugning*?—Or how is it reconcileable, either with common uſage, or with philoſophical preciſion, to uſe it in that negative ſenſe? Theſe are niceties which I leave the moſt Learned to decide:—For my part, I cannot eaſily conceive how it is poſſible to *maintain*—(i. e. "to ſpeak, *write* or preach" in *defence of*) the *Doctrines* and *Diſcipline* of *any* Church Eſtabliſhment, (as the members of *Ours* ſurely are required, both by duty and intereſt) without a *full perſuaſion* of their *truth* and *fitneſs*.

And to the *lukewarmneſs* alas! of ſuch deceitful labourers in the Eccleſiaſtical Vineyard, as content themſelves, with the mere *opus operatum* of their reſpective functions, or a mere *lip-ſervice*; "*without publicly impugning or ſpeaking againſt*, either the doctrine or diſcipline of their *own* or of *any other* Church or Sect; may we too juſtly attribute the decay of the vital Spirit of RELIGION, and deſertion of the principles of PROTESTANTISM; and

the

the growth of *Latitudinarianiſm* and *Infidelity*—— threatening in no long time, perhaps, *to overthrow* EVERY *Religious Eſtabliſhment throughout Chriſtendom!*

" *He that is* NOT WITH ME *is* AGAINST ME;
And he that GATHERETH NOT WITH ME, SCATTERETH."

—" *When* THE SON OF MAN *cometh,*
Will he find FAITH *upon the Earth?*
—or *genuine Chriſtianity* any where *eſtabliſhed*, in any Church.

Far be it however from my intention, even in the remoteſt degree, to impugn or impeach Doctor *Stokes's* ingenious and ſubtile diſtinction, between the philoſophical uſe of the Terms *Aſſent* and *Conſent*; but what THE CANONS ſeem to have " *joined together*," in common uſage, I cannot, as a conſcientious ſubſcriber, " *put asunder*" myſelf, or acquieſce, in what I conceive, to be an unjuſtifiable attempt, in any other; however reſpectable he may be for ſtation, talents, or authority.

III. And in order to decide the point, let us conſider the *intention* of the framers of *the Conſtitu-*

tions

tions and Canons Eccleſiaſtical of the Church of IRELAND.

From *Ware*, in his Life of *Primate Uſher*, p. 108. we learn, that

" In the Convocation of the Iriſh Clergy aſſembled A. D. 1634, He (*Uſher*) propoſed at the inſtance of the Lord Deputy *(Strafford)* and the Arch Biſhop of Canterbury *(Laud,)* that to expreſs the *agreement* of the Church of IRELAND, both in *Doctrine* and *Diſcipline*, with the Church of ENGLAND, the 39 ARTICLES of the Church of ENGLAND ſhould be received by the Church of IRELAND; which was *conſented* to by both *Houses of Convocation*, and the ſaid Articles were declared to be the CONFESSION OF FAITH in the Church of IRELAND."

" But here, there was a *Conteſt* between the *Lord Primate* and Doctor *Bramhall*, (then Biſhop of *Derry*) about eſtabliſhing CANONS for the Church of IRELAND; which the Biſhop of *Derry* would have had paſſed in the ſame *form* and *words* with thoſe in ENGLAND. The Lord *Primate* oppoſed this, as *prejudicial to the Liberties of the Church of* IRELAND."——(Leſt, if the *Engliſh Canons* had been paſſed

passed *verbatim*, it might have proved prejudicial to the Liberties of the Church of IRELAND"— as more fully explained by *Ware* himself in his Life of Bishop *Bramhall*, p. 120.)

"At last it was *unanimously* compromised and agreed that *some* of the Canons should be selected out of the *English Book of Canons*, and such *others* added as should be judged agreeable to the *polity* and *genius* of the Church of IRELAND. This was accordingly done; and a *Book of Constitutions and Canons* compiled, which was published in *Dublin* in 1635; and approved of by the King, and confirmed under the Broad Seal."

The *ready* adoption of the ENGLISH ARTICLES, is confirmed by Dr. *Stokes* himself, p 19. from *Bramhall's* works, p. 936, as follows:

"In the first Convocation, after the Earl of *Strafford's* coming to the Sword in IRELAND, the question was *calmly debated* in the House of *Bishops*, concerning the ENGLISH and IRISH ARTICLES, whether of them were *fitter* in point of *uncontroverted truth*, and *unity and conformity*, and prudential compliance with *tender consciences*, to be imposed on the

IRISH CLERGY"——" and after *a full and free diſcuſſion*, it was reſolved by *the very much greater majority of Votes*, for the ARTICLES OF ENGLAND."

And *Leland*, in his HISTORY OF IRELAND, Vol. iii. p. 28. informs us, " that there was but *one* member of the Convocation, who ventured publicly to avow his diſſent."

That there was a conteſt, however, between *the Lord Deputy* and Primate *Uſher*, reſpecting the framing of the IRISH CANONS, we learn from the Lord Deputy himſelf: *Strafford's Letters*, Vol. i. p. 381. in his Letter to Archbiſhop *Laud*:

" I am clear of your Lordſhip's opinion, it were fit the CANONS OF ENGLAND were received HERE as well as THE ARTICLES; But the *Primate* is hugely againſt it: The buſineſs is merely point of honour, (or as Sir *Thomas Cogneſby* would have expreſſed it) *matter of punctilio*; leſt IRELAND might become ſubject to the Church of ENGLAND, as the Province of *York* is to that of *Canterbury*: Needs forſooth! We muſt be *a Church of Ourſelves*, which is utterly loſt, unleſs the Canons HERE differ,

ſer, albeit *not in ſubſtance*, yet in *some form* from yours in ENGLAND."

Doctor *Stokes* informs us p. 15, that "Biſhop *Bramhall* was the perſon who framed and worded the IRISH CANONS"—This, however it may be aſſerted by the writer of his life, may well be queſtioned from the higher authority of Lord *Strafford*, Vol. i, p. 343. in his Letter to Arch Biſhop *Laud*:

"Becauſe there ſhould be no queſtion [in the *Iriſh* Convocation in the *Canon* that was thus to be voted for eſtabliſhing the ARTICLES OF ENGLAND] I did deſire that my Lord Primate would be pleaſed to frame it; and after I had peruſed it, I would ſend the Prolocutor (Dean *Leiſly*) a draft of the Canon to be propounded, encloſed in a letter of my own."——

"The Primate accordingly framed a Canon, (a copy whereof you have here) which I not ſo well approving, *drew up one myſelf, more after the words* of the CANON OF ENGLAND; which I held beſt for me to keep as cloſe to, as I could; and then ſent it to my Lord."

" His Grace came inſtantly to me, and told me, he feared the Canon would never paſs in ſuch form, as I had made it; but he was hopeful as he had drawn it, it might; beſought me therefore to think a little better of it:"

——" I told his Lordſhip, I was reſolved to put it to them in *thoſe very words*; and was moſt confident there were not *ſix in the Houſe*, that would refuſe them: telling him *by the ſequel we ſhould ſee, whether his Lordſhip or myſelf better underſtood their minds in that point; and by that I would be content to be judged.*"——

" Without delay then, I writ a Letter to Dean *Leiſly* (the Copy whereof I likewiſe ſend you) with the Canon incloſed; which accordingly *that afternoon was unanimouſly voted*, firſt with the *Biſhops*, and then by the *reſt of the Clergy*, excepting *one man*; (you ſhall find his name among the Committees) who did ſingly deliberate upon the receiving of THE ARTICLES OF ENGLAND."

Surely this evidence is moſt deciſive, that it was neither Primate *Uſher* nor Biſhop *Bramhall*, nor any Member or Members of the Convocation, who drew

drew up or framed the *Iriſh Canon*, eſtabliſhing in IRELAND the Articles of the Church of ENGLAND, but Lord *Strafford* himſelf: and if ſo, can we heſitate a moment about "*the Lawgiver*'s *intention*?" whether they were meant by Lord Strafford as "*Articles of Faith* or *Opinion*, or merely *Articles of Peace*?"——or whether by the term "CONSENT," this ſtrenuous and powerful Advocate for the reception of the ENGLISH CANONS, did not moſt fully and explicitly mean to include "*unfeigned Aſſent*?" And I will leave it even to the deciſion of Doctor *Stokes* himſelf, whether "*the Legiſlative Aſſembly, who enacted it in his words*"—enacted it in a *different ſenſe*? *Eſſay*, p. 21.

IV. Whether Biſhop *Bramhall* underſtood that "*our* Laws have men's *Practices* NOT *their Opinions* for their *object*"—as Doctor *Stokes* conceives, p. 31. may well be queſtioned, from the following Extract from *Bramhall*, p. 936, cited, *Eſſay*, p. 19.

"It is mere mockery to cry up *liberty of Conſcience*, and have *no liberty for Opinions*:—to reſt in *general Truths* which no Party can deny to be *ſufficient to ſalvation*, doth commonly produce *Unity*; But the *particular* determinations of *unneceſſary*, *controverted*

troverted points, is *for the moſt part*, inconſiſtent with it: and if it be *over-suddenly* preſſed, like ſtrong medicines to a body unprepared, encreaſeth the malady. As men have more power over their own actions than over their own judgments; by ſo much, their *Practices* are *more proper* objects of LAWS than their *Opinions*."

Here the Biſhop by no means aſſerts that *Opinions* are *not proper objects* of *Human Laws*—they unqueſtionably are, whenever they involve or juſtify *Practices* repugnant to the *Laws* of GOD, or injurious to the *Conſtitution* of the eſtabliſhed Government in *Church* and *State*—He only aſſerts that *practices* in general are *more proper objects* than *opinions*: and he ſpecifies the Opinions meant.——" the *particular* determinations, (whether by *Articles* or *Canons*) of *controverted*, ſpeculative points of doctrine, which are *not* adjudged *neceſſary to ſalvation*."——Such are all thoſe, which according to the glorious Liberty of *our Articles*, are merely of *human Authority*, and " *not contained* in HOLY SCRIPTURE, ſo as not *to be read* therein nor *proved* thereby."—*Article* VI. All which are to be expounded or interpreted according to that Golden Canon, preſcribed in the XX. *Article*; moderating *the Authority of the Church*, within

within its due bounds:——"Not *so* to expound *one* place of SCRIPTURE, that it be *repugnant* to *another*."

An Admirable Canon of Criticiſm indeed, equally applicable, to the interpretation of all *Human Laws* and *Ordinances*, Eccleſiaſtical or Civil, as well as of HOLY WRIT.

V. And for this *Latitude* of Interpretation, warranted by the Articles themſelves, I will contend no leſs ſtrenuouſly than Doctor *Stokes*: And this I am perſuaded, is all that was meant, by thoſe great Divines and illuſtrious and undaunted Defenders of the Faith, *Tillotſon*, *Burnet*, *Hoadley*, *Stillingfleet*, *Saunderſon*, *Williams*, &c. &c.——But I will not reſt my right of *private Judgment*, to interpret SCRIPTURE, *Articles*, or *Canons*, on nice and ſubtile diſtinctions between the *Civil* and *Philoſophical uſe* of a ſingle word; inaſmuch as the Terms of all Laws human and divine are to be underſtood in their ordinary or uſual acceptation; and as the meaning of any particular text of Scripture, is beſt to be diſcovered from the whole Tenor of Holy Writ; ſo the meaning of any particular phraſe or expreſſion, in any Article or Canon, is beſt to be interpreted by compariſon of all the reſt therewith.

I frankly

I frankly own, that I accede to *the laſt declaration* of the Great and liberal minded Biſhop *Burnet*; than whom no man ſtudied the 39 Articles more critically, nor underſtood them better. *Hiſtory of his own Times.—Concluſion.*

" I have always had a true zeal for the Church of ENGLAND; I have lived in its connection with great joy, and have purſued its true intereſt with an unfeigned affection: yet I muſt ſay, there are many things in it that have been *very uneasy to me:*

" The requiring *ſubſcription to the* 39 Articles is a great *impoſition:* I BELIEVE THEM ALL MYSELF; but as thoſe about *Original Sin* and *Predeſtination* might be expreſſed *more unexceptionably*, ſo I think it is a better way, to let ſuch matters continue ſtill to be the STANDARD OF DOCTRINE, with ſome *few* Corrections; and to *cenſure* thoſe who *teach* any *contrary doctrines*; than to oblige *all* who ſerve in the Church, to *ſubſcribe* to them: The greater part ſubſcribe without ever *examining* them; And others do it becauſe they *muſt* do it, though they can hardly ſatisfy their conſciences about *ſome* things in them.—*Churches* and *Societies* are much

much better ſecured by *Laws* than by *Subſcriptions*: It is a *more reaſonable* as well as *more eaſy* method of Government."

Of the Articles of *human Impoſition*, preſcribed by *any* eſtabliſhed Church upon Earth, "*the beſt*" are thoſe, like the beſt man, *that are chargeable with the feweſt faults*." And theſe of the Church of ENGLAND and IRELAND, with all their alleged imperfections, are perhaps the beſt of any Church ſubſiſting upon Earth.—I know of none at preſent comparable thereto; nor any formerly, except perhaps, the ALBIGEOISE *Confeſſion of Faith*, in A. D. 1200, which is conſidered as a *Chef d'oeuvre*; (See, in the IRISH PURSUITS OF LITERATURE, p. 98. a Tranſlation of theſe Articles, from the Latin of SANDS, Hiſt. Eccles. p. 425.) And for a further Vindication of our ARTICLES, upon the foregoing principles of the VI. and XX. Articles, See the INSPECTOR, *London*, *White*, 1799.

And to eaſe this "yoke" and lighten this "burthen" of *Subſcription* to the Articles, in the full ſenſe plainly intended by the framers, of "*un-*" "*feigned aſſent*," to the doctrines, and "*conſent*"

to the diſcipline and uſage of the Siſter Churches of ENGLAND and IRELAND;——(For I conſider the *Iriſh Clergy*, as much bound in *foro conſcientiæ*, by the IRISH CANONS, as the *Engliſh*, by their CANONS and STATUTES conjointly,)—I heartily long for more Halcyon days of public Peace and domeſtic Tranquillity, when "*the Pillars*" of our United Church may be enabled to inſtitute a cautious and ſkilful *Reviſe*, and a moderate and temperate *Reform*, of ſuch *Articles*, or ſuch *expreſſions* as are an offence to Weak Brethren, a ridicule to Scoffers, and a plea for Separation to Diſſenters; moſt ardently wiſhing, that the time may come, and that quickly, when we ſhall become *One fold under one Shepherd*—when all denominations of *Chriſtians* ſhall in "*the ſucceeding Age*," or Diſpenſation, evince the purity of their *Faith* by the holineſs of their *Practice!*

May this Haſty Sketch, not dictated by a ſpirit of controverſy, by a fondneſs for paradox, or by *the pride and naughtineſs* of Authorſhip, but in the ſpirit of "brotherly kindneſs and of Charity," be read, with the ſame candour and ſincerity with which it is written: and let not my reſpected friend, Doctor *Stokes*, and fellow-labourer in the paths

paths of Literature, be offended, if I have freely canvaſſed his argument, and noticed what, however ingenious, ſeems to be not ſolid reaſoning.—The *diſcovery of Truth*, ſhould be the grand Aim and object of all our joint reſearches, in this *Twilight* State of Diſcipline and probation, and *Infancy of Science* both ſacred and profane.——In ſuch a glorious purſuit, Let us not *fall out by the way*; but endeavour, *if it be poſſible, and as much as in us lieth, to keep the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of Peace*, both collectively and individually.

ESTO PERPETUA!

KILLESANDRA:
April 2, 1800.

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the foregoing Obſervations were ſent to the Preſs, I met with a Vindication of the 39 Articles, and of their venerable Framers, from the long imputed Charge of *Calviniſm*, publiſhed laſt year by a reſpectable Engliſh Divine, Mr. *Daubeny*, in the Fourth letter of *the Appendix to his Guide to the Church*, Rivingtons, 1799; ſelected by the

the *Britiſh Critic*, in their Review of that work, March 1800, p. 239, &c. which, as it proceeds on the ſame grounds of *Rational* and *Scriptural* Interpretation, preſcribed by the VI. and XX. Articles, and adopted in the preceding Argument, may ſerve to ſtamp an Additional Authority thereon; and by ſuch coincidence of Sentiments between two independent and unconnected "Labourers in the ſacred Vineyards" of ENGLAND and IRELAND, tend to illuſtrate that *Unity of Faith* and *Diſcipline*, which has hitherto, and will I truſt continue to ſubſiſt, between both; and with God's help, improve, that Harmony of Opinion, and co-operation of pious and diſcreet zeal, ſo eſſential to ſupport and uphold the venerable Fabric of our *Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution*, from the Breaches daily and hourly made therein by the joint and perſevering Aſſaults of *Sectarianiſm* and *Infidelity*.

A HOUSE DIVIDED AGAINST A HOUSE FALLETH.

I. Mr. Daubeny undertakes to prove that the Peculiar Doctrines of *Calviniſm* are NOT the doctrines of the Church of ENGLAND:

"There are certain poſitions" ſays he, "which require

require only to be plainly ſtated to be generally received; becauſe being *ſelf-evident* they ſtand in no need of proof. Of this kind is the following: That our *Reformers*, in the *Articles*, *Homilies* and *Liturgy*, in laying down a collected Syſtem of Chriſtian Doctrine, *did not mean to contradict themſelves*: ——Conſequently, that our Church in the *Subſcription to her Articles*, does not require a Confeſſion of Faith from her Clergy *different* from that which they are taught to preach to their Congregations in the *eſtabliſhed Liturgy*." p. 201.

He then ſhews by evidence abſolutely incontrovertible, that *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Latimer* and *Hooper*, who chiefly projected and compleated the Reformation of our Church, were not themſelves *Calviniſts*:

" *Cranmer* paid the higheſt regard to *Melancthon's* Opinion; and the *Twentieth Article* was expreſsly drawn up *againſt* the rigid doctrine of *Predeſtination*, in conſequence of a particular communication between theſe two celebrated Divines on that head. Melancthon's words, in an epiſtle to Cranmer in the year 1548, (three years before our Articles were finiſhed) were theſe:

" Nimis

'Nimis horridæ fuerunt initio *Stoicæ diſputationes* apud noſtros *De Fato*, et Diſciplinæ nocuerunt. Quare te rogo, ut de *tali aliquâ Formula Doctrinæ* cogites.'

"What was Melancthon's Opinion on the Subject of *Predeſtination* (to which the foregoing paſſage evidently alludes) is evident from the *Augſburgh Confeſſion of Faith*; in which, after aſſerting the promiſe of *Grace* to be univerſal, and explaining the grounds of the *Remiſſion of Sins* and *Juſtification*, he adds:——'Non eſt hic opus diſputatione de *Prædeſtinatione* aut ſimilibus: Nam promiſſio eſt univerſalis; et nihil detrahit *Operibus*, imo exſuſcitat ad *Fidem* et *vere bona Opera*.' Cap. de Fide." P. 20.

In addition to this Argument, which is corroborated by large Extracts from the writings of the *Engliſh Reformers*, Mr. D. obſerves,

"That ſoon after *Edward's* eſtabliſhment on the Throne, a *Paraphraſe of the New Teſtament* was ordered by Authority, to be ſet up in all Churches, for general information.——Now, at this time *Luther* had publiſhed a Commentary on the Galatians,

tions, and *Calvin*, his Inſtitutes: But it was the Paraphraſe of *Eraſmus*, which OUR REFORMERS thought moſt proper to promote the object in view on this occaſion;—the Paraphraſe of a Man who had diſtinguiſhed himſelf in oppoſition to the *Errors* both of *Luther* and *Calvin*, on the Subject of the *enſlaved* Will, and *abſolute* Decrees.—The Argument to be drawn from this circumſtance, in favour of *our* REFORMERS *not being, what all* CALVINISTS *are deſirous of repreſenting them*, it is to be preſumed, is ſuch as no *Calviniſt* will ever anſwer: For, if our Reformers meant that the Doctrine of our Church ſhould be received in the *Calviniſtic* ſenſe; and at the ſame time, made uſe of a *Paraphraſe* calculated to convey a different ſenſe to her members; they were pulling down with one hand, what they profeſſed to be building up with the other." P. 210.

II. Mr. *Daubeny* next proceeds to try the Article itſelf—upon which his Antagoniſt, Sir *Richard Hill* had built his favourite poſition, "that the *faſhionable Syſtem of Divinity* and *faſhionable preaching*," (as he was pleaſed to term that of the Eſtabliſhed Clergy) is ſomething very different from *the true doctrine* of the Church of ENGLAND"—By the ſame

ſame rule of Judgment, already applied to the Compoſers of it: namely, that *As a Compoſition deſigned for the uſe of the Chriſtian Miniſtry, it muſt convey one determinate ſenſe, and cannot contradict itſelf.*"

"Now the main Subſtance of this Article, according to *Sir Richard Hill's* ſcheme (founded as it ſeems, on the extravagant doctrines of the *Antinomian Calviniſts*) in *his Apology for Brotherly Love*—— teaches *the abſolute and unconditional Election*, and conſequently *Salvation of particular perſons*:—But the concluding part of the Article, in the moſt plain and decided terms, teaches the very oppoſite doctrine; by telling us, that GOD's *promiſes are to be received, as they are generally ſet forth in* HOLY SCRIPTURE."——Theſe promiſes are *general* and *conditional:* The Sacred Scriptures informing us, that *Redemption* by CHRIST is as general as was the *fall* by ADAM; And the redemption conditional itſelf:"

[For ſince through *Man* came Death;
Through *Man* came alſo the Reſurrection of the Dead:
For as in *Adam All die,*
Even ſo in CHRIST ſhall *all be made alive.*"

1 Cor. xv. 21.

Since then, through *One Man's* trangreſſion,
Came *(judgment)* upon *all men* to *condemnation*;
Even ſo, through *one man's* righteouſneſs,
Came (the *free gift)* upon *all men* to *juſtification of Life.* *Rom.* v. 18.

For the *Wages of Sin* is *Death*;
But *the Gift of* GOD is *eternal Life,*
In JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD.
Rom. vi. 23.

We obſerve JESUS, who for a little while was degraded below Angels, on account of the ſufferance of Death, [now] crowned with glory and honour: To the end that, by GOD's *grace*, he ſhould taſte death for *every man.*
Heb. ii. 9.

Then *Peter* opened his mouth, and ſaid: In truth I comprehend, that GOD is no *Reſpecter of Perſons*; but in *every Nation, whoſoever feareth* HIM and *worketh* RIGHTEOUSNESS, is acceptable unto HIM." *Acts*, x. 34.

Work out *your own ſalvation*, with fear and trembling: For it is GOD who worketh in you both *to will* and *to perform*, of his good pleaſure.
Phil. ii. 12.

Compare *Matt.* xxv. 9. and 2 *Cor.* iii. 5. *Heb.* viii. 10.

For

For if we *wilfully* ſin after receiving Information of the Truth, there is no longer left a Sacrifice for ſins; but a fearful expectation of Judgment, and fiery indignation, deſtined to devour the Adverſaries.

Heb. x. 26.

But I *(Paul)* mortify my body, and reduce it under ſubjection, leſt by any means, after I have preached to others, I *myſelf* might become *a Caſtaway.* 1 Cor. ix. 27.

Wherefore, Brethren, be *ye* more earneſt, to make your *calling* and *election* ſure: for *if* ye do theſe *(works,)* ye ſhall never fall. 2 *Pet.* i. 10.

"I conceive then, ſays Mr. *Daubeny*, that I ſubſcribe to the *Seventeenth Article*, in that ſenſe in which it is deſigned by our Church that it ſhould be ſubſcribed;——When I maintain that the doctrine of *Predeſtination* contained in it, is not to be underſtood in that *particular* and *excluſive* ſenſe, which has been annexed to it by ſome Chriſtians; but in its general application to that *Plan of Salvation by* JESUS CHRIST, *conceived in* THE DIVINE MIND, *before the foundation of the World*:——According to which it is the ſettled purpoſe of GOD that *Every man ſhall be ſaved*, who ſhall, through the Aſſiſtance of DIVINE GRACE, be found in conformity

with that plan. For the particulars of which plan, ſo far as they reſpect *Man's* conduct in the buſineſs, recourſe is to be had to the WILL OF GOD, as revealed in the Scripture"——" Every other interpretation which has been annexed to this Article, by different men, conveys a ſenſe which *it does not maintain*; and which the Article was framed, not to maintain, but *to avoid*." p. 217.

" According to this idea, the Reformers in the Seventeenth Article, with the view of *counteracting the falſe Opinions* which prevailed upon the Subject, deſigned only to give *a Scriptural* Delineation of CHRISTIANITY, conſidered as *the everlaſting purpoſe* of THE DEITY; that by becoming an intereſting object of contemplation and *comfort* to fallen Man, it might thus, *rightly contemplated*, from "*the aſſured knowledge that his labours would not be in vain in the* LORD," tend to the more effectual promotion of Chriſtian Piety and Chriſtian Endeavours. Our Church can ſcarcely be ſaid to *lay down any doctrine* in this Article, but only gives a ſeries of Texts relative to *a Myſterious Subject*; chiefly for the purpoſe of *guarding againſt the abuſe* of them. In the preceding Article (the 16th) our Church plainly reprobates the *Antiſcriptural doctrine* of *abſolute predeſtination* held by the *Supralapſarians*, *Auguſtine*,

tine, &c. aſſerting that "*After we have received the* HOLY GHOST, *we may depart from Grace given, and fall into Sin*, &c. p. 219.

——"The concluſion I would draw from the above premiſes, applicable to the Seventeenth Article is this: That as *Reprobation* is inſeparately connected with the Doctrine of *Predeſtination*, in the *Calviniſtic* Senſe; and conſequently could not have been omitted in an Article deſigned [as *Calviniſts* allege] to convey *that ſenſe*; And as it has no *neceſſary* connexion with *Predeſtination*, conſidered in Scripture as the everlaſting purpoſe of GOD, relative to *the Covenant of Grace* in JESUS CHRIST; the circumſtance of its being *totally omitted* in the Seventeenth Article, coupled with the conſideration of a Clauſe being inſerted for the expreſs purpoſe of guarding againſt ſuch an idea, proves to me, that the Article was unqueſtionably meant to be taken in the latter Senſe." p. 225.

And this explanation of the purport of the Article, and intention of the Framers, given by Mr. *Daubeny*, I will add, is warranted by Biſhop *Burnet*, in his elaborate and cautious explanation thereof, candidly, and for the moſt part, judiciouſly ſtating the oppoſite interpretations of the *Calviniſts* and *Remonſtrants* or *Arminians*.

Calvin

N. B. *Calvin* nearly followed the Opinions of *Auguſtine* and the *Latin Church*; And *Arminius*, at the head of the *Remonſtrants*, thoſe of *Chryſoſtom* and the *Greek* Church. *Arminius* oppoſed the former, but not until *after* our Articles were compiled.

"It is very probable," ſays Biſhop *Burnet*, "that they who penned it meant that the *decree was abſolute*; but yet ſince they have not ſaid it, theſe who ſubſcribe the Articles, do not ſeem to be bound to any thing that is *not expreſſed* therein."—

—"Though others infer from the Cautions added thereto, that the Doctrine laid down in the Article, muſt be ſo underſtood as to agree with theſe Cautions; and therefore they argue, that ſince *abſolute Predeſtination* cannot conſiſt with them, that therefore the Article is to be *otherwiſe* explained. They ſay, the natural conſequence of an *Abſolute Decree*, is either *preſumption* or *deſpair*: ſince upon that bottom, a man reckons, that *which way ſoever* the decree is made, it muſt certainly be accompliſhed." *Burnet*, p. 168. Fol.

And that the latter inference was the ſenſe of the Framers,

Framers rather than the former, plainly appears from the Cautions themſelves:

ARTICLE XVII.

I.—" *For Curious and Carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the ſentence of* GOD's *Predeſtination, is a moſt dangerous downfall; whereby the Devil doth thruſt them either into Deſperation, or into Wretchleſſneſs of moſt unclean living, no leſs perilous than Deſperation.*"

II. " *Furthermore, we muſt receive* GOD's *promiſes in ſuch wiſe as they be generally ſet forth to us in* HOLY SCRIPTURE: And

III. *In our doings, that* WILL OF GOD *is to be followed, which we have expreſſly declared unto us in the* WORD OF GOD."

This whole Article of *Prædeſtination*, and theſe concluding Cautions in particular, are evidently taken from the REFORMATIO LEGUM ECCLESIASTICARUM, began in the reign of *Henry* VIII. and continued in the reign of *Edward* VI. 1552; in the Article DE HÆRESIBUS, Cap 22. *De Prædeſtinatione.*

" Ad extremum, in ECCLESIA *multi feris et diſſolutis*

dissolutis moribus vivunt, qui, cum reipsa *curiosi sint distorti luxu, et a spiritu* CHRISTI *prorsus alieni, semper Prædestinationem* et *Rejectionem*, vel (ut usitate loquuntur) *Reprobationem, in sermone jactant*; ut, cum *æterno consilio Deus* vel *de Salute* vel *de Interitu* aliquid certi constituerit, inde latebram suis maleficiis et sceleribus, et omnis generis perversitati, quærant. Et cum Pastores dissipatam illorum et flagitiosam vitam coarguunt, '*in voluntatem* DEI *criminum* SUORUM *culpam conferunt*;' et hac Defensione profligatas Admonitorum reprehensiones existimant: ac ita tandem, *Duce Diabolo*, vel *in desperationem presentem abjiciuntur præcipites*; vel *ad solutam quandam et mollem vitæ securitatem, sine aut pœnitentiâ aut scelerum conscientiâ, dilabuntur. Quæ duo mala*, disparem naturam sed *finem videntur eundem habere.*

" NOS *vero* SACRIS SCRIPTURIS *eruditi*, talem in hac re *Doctrinam* ponimus, quod *diligens et accurata cogitatio de Prædestinatione nostrâ et Electione, suscepta sit; de quibus*, " DEI *voluntati determinatum fuit antequam mundi fundamenta jacerentur.*" Hæc itaque 'diligens et seria (quam diximus) his de rebus cogitatio,' priorum hominum animos spiritu CHRISTI afflatos; et carnis et membrorum subjectionem præsentes, [præsentientes] et ad cœlestia

sursum

ſurſum tendentes, dulciſſimâ quâdam et jucundiſſimâ conſolatione permulcet: quoniam *Fidem noſtram de perpetuâ ſalute per* CHRISTUM *ad nos perventurâ confirmat; vehementiſſimas charitatis in* DEUM *flammas accendit; mirabiliter ad gratias agendas exſuscitat; ad bona nos opera propinquiſſimè adducit; et a peccatis longiſſime abducit; quoniam* a DEO *ſumus electi, et* FILII EJUS *inſtituti:* quæ ſingularis et eximia conditio ſummam a nobis ſalubritatem morum, et excellentiſſimam Virtutis perfectionem requirit. Denique, Nobis *arrogantiam* minuit, ne viribus noſtris credamus quæ *gratuitâ* DEI *beneficentiâ et bonitate indulgentur.* Præterea, *Neminem ex hoc loco purgationem* cenſemus *vitiorum ſuorum afferre poſſe; quia* DEUS *nihil ullâ in re injuſti conſtituit, nec ad peccata voluntates noſtras unquam invitas trudit.*

" QUA PROPTER, *Omnes* a NOBIS *admonendi ſunt uti in actionibus ſuscipiendis ad decreta* PRÆDESTINATIONIS *ſe non referant, ſed univerſam vitæ ſuæ rationem ad* DEI LEGES *accommodent; cum et promiſſiones Bonis, et minas Malis, in* SACRIS SCRIPTURIS GENERALITER PROPOSITAS *contemplentur: Debemus enim ad* DEI CULTUM *viis iis ingredi, et* in illâ DEI VOLUNTATE *commorari, quam in* SACRIS SCRIPTURIS *patefactam eſſe videmus.*"

From this admirable *Archetype* of the *Seventeenth* Article, framed in the true Spirit and uniform tenor of Holy Writ, (and alſo from the *Sixteenth*,) it might perhaps be queſtioned, whether Biſhop *Burnet* has not conceded rather too much, in aſſerting that "It is *very probable* that they who penned the Article, meant that the *Decree was abſolute*"—Eſpecially when he further ſtates in his Analyſis of the Arguments of the *Remonſtrants*, that

"The *univerſal* extent of the death of CHRIST, ſeems to be very plainly affirmed, in the moſt ſolemn parts of *all* the Offices of the Church: For in the Office of Communion and in the Prayer of Conſecration we own, that CHRIST, "*by the one oblation of himſelf once offered, made there a full, perfect and ſufficient ſacrifice, oblation and ſatisfaction for the ſins of the* WHOLE WORLD."—"And there are yet more expreſs words in our Church Catechiſm to this purpoſe; (which is to be conſidered as the moſt ſolemn Declaration of the Senſe of the Church, ſince that is the Doctrine in which ſhe inſtructs all her Children:) And in that part of it which ſeems to be moſt important, as being the ſhort ſummary of the Apoſtles Creed, it is ſaid—"GOD THE SON, *who hath redeemed Me and* ALL *Mankind:*"

Mankind:" Where *All* muſt ſtand in the ſame extent of Univerſality as in the precedent and following words,—" THE FATHER *who made me and* ALL *the World*;"——THE HOLY GHOST *who ſanctifieth me and* ALL *the Elect People of God*: which being to be underſtood ſeverely and without exception, this, muſt alſo be taken in the ſame ſtrictneſs."—*Burnet*, p. 168.

Although Biſhop *Burnet*, ſtating the whole Controverſy fairly and impartially, has from motives of delicacy, forborn "on this occaſion to declare *his own* opinion;" yet it is plain from the foregoing extracts, that he ſided with the *Remonſtrants*, rather than with the *Calviniſts*—And he has not ſcrupled to declare it upon other occaſions:

"I have not in the explanation of the 17th Article told what *my own* Opinion was; yet here I think it may be fitting to own, that I follow the doctrine of the *Greek* Church, [as taught by *Origen*, *Chryſoſtom*, &c.] from which St. *Auſtin* departed and formed a new Syſtem." *Preface to the* 39 *Articles*, p. vi,

Hence it appears that Biſhop *Burnet's* Senti-

ments, adopted by our moſt Judicious Divines, Dr. *Waterland*, Biſhop *Prettyman*, &c. and now by Mr. *Daubeny*, are nearly the ſame in ſubſtance; and to theſe reſpectable *Engliſh* Authorities, I, as a member of the Church of *Ireland*, give my *unfeigned Aſſent* and *Conſent*.

III. Having vindicated our Reformers from the imputation of *Calvinism*, Mr. D. accounts for the prevalence of that Syſtem in the Church at a ſubſequent Period.

"The *Marian* Perſecution threw many of our moſt exemplary Divines into the very Hotbed of Calviniſm—who fled to *Geneva* and *Zurich*—from whence in due time, they returned to their own Country, on the death of Queen *Mary*, luxuriant, if I may ſo ſay, in the growth of theſe opinions, with reſpect both to the diſcipline and doctrine of the CHRISTIAN Church; which when arrived at maturity, effected the deſtruction of our *National Conſtitution*."

"Although Calviniſm prevailed much in the reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, yet it was not underſtood to be certainly *the Sense of our Articles*, even by thoſe

those who held this Doctrine:——We are told by *Strype*, that till about the year 1595, *Calvin's* way of explaining the Divine decrees, was not entertained by many learned men of the University of *Cambridge*."

"If Justice therefore be done in this case, the Clergy who brought this disgrace upon our *Sound and Scriptural Church Doctrine*, by the unsound and unscriptural Comments, glosses and notions, which (as Bishop *Hall* somewhere says) "*they fished out of the Lake of Geneva*," should *bear their own burden*; whilst our Reformers are suffered *to go free*." p. 230.

These few Extracts from Mr. *Daubeny's* meritorious and seasonable Publication, supported by the high Authority of Bishop *Burnet*, will, I trust, be deemed full, perfect and sufficient, for the exculpation of that admirable, though still improveable *form of sound Words* contained in our Articles, and of the venerable Framers themselves, from the injurious though prevailing imputation of *Calvinism*; An imputation indolently and implicitly acquiesced under, by too many of the Clergy who ought to know better things.

The

The alarming increaſe of *Latitudinarianiſm* and *Schiſm* indeed, in ENGLAND, founded on ſuch *uncontradicted* miſrepreſentations, is thus ably ſtated by Mr. D.

" Separation from *the Church* of this Country is daily increaſing *(a)*. Funds are eſtabliſhed, and

(a) There is a Sect of *Methodiſts*, who profeſs to be members of the Church of *England*, and regularly attend Divine Service, and partake of the Holy Sacrament; but have places ſet apart for *additional* exerciſes of Devotion, at ſuch hours as do not interfere with the Church Service; and who therefore are *not* uſually conſidered " *as enemies to the Eccleſiaſtical Eſtabliſhment.*"——But ſurely, the ſetting up other places of worſhip, and following ſelf-appointed and unauthorized lay-Teachers, aſſuming to themſelves the title of *Goſpel Preachers*, and libelloufly aſperſing the *eſtabliſhed Clergy*, as not preaching the genuine Goſpel of CHRIST, is abundantly ſufficient to evince, that their profeſſions of attachment are *falſe and hollow.* And the reaſon which they do not heſitate to aſſign for their Conduct, puts the matter out of all queſtion: It is, *that they may hear doctrines more evangelical, and Preachers more ſuited to their taſte*——Such is the ill-diſguiſed prevarication of thoſe who affect to remain in fellowſhip with the Eſtabliſhed Church, when their ſentiments and inclinations go another way.—Surely they are more dangerous than open Seceders. See BRITISH CRITIC 1800, *April*, p. 410.

Writers

Writers employed to propagate and ſupport *the Cauſe of Schiſm.*

" To preach and ſpread what is called *the Goſpel*, carries with it a plauſible ſound, well calculated to deceive the unwary; and thus perſons of reſpectability both for Piety and Character, [*Sir Richard Hill*, &c. &c.] are brought to countenance the proceeding. You may perhaps have heard, Sir, that *the number of Licenses granted for places of diſſenting worſhip* are, in *some* parts of the Kingdom, *increased within the last year, in a proportion of six to one.* But it is probable you do not know, that ſome of the ſelf-conſtituted Teachers who apply for them, are of ſo low a deſcription of perſons, as *to be obliged to ſubstitute their Mark for their Names!*———Such are many of theſe *Itinerant Preachers*, whoſe office it is, under the plauſible Idea of ſpreading the Goſpel, to intrude themſelves unſolicited into Pariſhes, in order to draw away Congregations from their regular Miniſters; and to ſpread through the Country theſe Seeds of *Diſaffection to the Eſtabliſhment* both in *Church* and *State*, which cannot fail, if not counteracted, to bring in due time an abundant *Harveſt.*" p. 528.

And

And ſtill more alarming is the Caſe of IRELAND, where a thinly ſcattered Clergy have to combat the Superſtition and Fanaticiſm of numerons Hoſts of Papiſts and Diſſenters, and to deplore the lukewarmneſs and alienation of thoſe of their own Houſehold: And how the zealous and ſtrenuous endeavours of the *Clerical* Order in this Country, to maintain and ſupport the Eſtabliſhed Government in all emergencies; (and more eſpecially during the late diſaſtrous ſeaſon of Inſurrection and Rebellion,) have been requited and recompenſed, Poſterity will read with wonder and aſtoniſhment, in the *Votes* and *Acts* of THE IRISH PARLIAMENT, from 1735 to 1800, reſpecting *Tythe-agiſtment*, &c.

O that OUR RULERS *were wise!*
That they understood this!
That they would conſider THEIR LATTER END!—

——The future welfare of THEMSELVES and of their POSTERITY with which the due ſupport and foſtering encouragement of the ESTABLISHED CHURCH, is ſo intimately and indiſſolubly connected. For let vain Philoſophers and ſhallow Politicians allege what they will, "there can be no

no *National Proſperity* of any duration, without *Religion*; And there can be no Religion, without a *Reſpectable Clergy*; nor a reſpectable Clergy, ſufficiently *numerous* for the exigencies of the Country, without a *decent maintenance* being annexed to the office."——If this be wanting in IRELAND, to ſupport our ſickly and puny Church Eſtabliſhment, (*b*) it will ſoon be degraded to the level of the

(*b*) Through the defalcation of the dues of the Parochial Clergy of IRELAND, by a gradual and ſyſtematic courſe of Encroachment on the part of the Laity, &c. from the time of the *Reformation*, untill the preſent day; 2436 Pariſhes formerly with Cure of Souls, employing about 3000 Clergy Secular and Regular, are now dwindled to 1129 Benefices, and 1001 Churches; employing about 1300 Clergy of all deſcriptions, Rectors, Vicars and Curates: ——How enviably different is the State of the Church of ENGLAND! There, within the ſame period, the number of Pariſhes, has riſen from 3,181 to 10,567; containing at preſent 11,755 Churches, employing about 18000 Clergy of all deſcriptions. Thus, have the Clergy of IRELAND been reduced conſiderably more than one-half, from the inadequacy of their proviſions; which at the preſent day is eſtimated at not more than 195,000l. a-year; or leſs than a *twenty-fourth part* of the computed Rental of IRELAND, *Five Millions Sterling*, per Annum: whereas in ENGLAND, the Officiating Clergy have been augmented more

the Church of SCOTLAND; where the men who ſhould fill the "Prieſts' Offices," from their rank in life, their Learning and their Probity, are now

than fourfold—and the Revenues of the Church, according to the moſt accurate eſtimates, encreaſed from 43,537l. to 1,313,000l. affording a taxable income of 1,125,000l. or about a *ſixteenth part* of the computed Rental of ENGLAND, *Twenty Millions* per Annum.

The whole Proviſion for the Miniſters of the Kirk of SCOTLAND, in the year 1755, was about 68,500l. per Annum, which being divided between 944 Miniſters, afforded to each on an average, 72l. per Annum: a pittance too ſmall to uphold the reſpectability of the Scottiſh Church In ENGLAND, the average income of Pariſh Prieſts, is about 141l. each per Annum; In IRELAND, the average is about 150l. per Annum: But to make Ireland a Proteſtant Country, the number of her Eſtabliſhed Clergy ought to be trebled:—An event not to be looked for in the preſent age, and under the late Interdict.

N. B. The foregoing eſtimates of the State and Revenues of the Churches of *England, Ireland and Scotland*, are extracted from three valuable Publications—*Cove on the Revenues of the Church of England*; *Beeke's* Maſterly *Obſervations on the Produce of the Income Tax*, rectifying ſome miſtatements of Mr. *Roſe's* Pamphlet; and *Smith on the Agriculture of Argyll*, MONTHLY REVIEW, *Feb.* 1800, p. 133.

betaking

betaking themſelves to ſecular and more lucrative employments, and their places are ſupplied, by an inferior Claſs, by ſuch as *ought to have neither lot nor part in the matter.*" Such are the recent and pathetic repreſentations of reſpectable *Scottiſh Miniſters*, " complaining of the *inadequacy* of the Fund *allotted in lieu of Tythe* throughout SCOTLAND, for their maintenance; whereby their *rank* in Society is ſunk, and with it, their *utility* and *influence.*" See the MONTHLY REVIEW, 1800, *February*, p. 133.

I ſhall conclude this POSTSCRIPT, with the following impreſſive paragraph of my reſpectable and well informed fellow-labourer, Mr. *Daubeny*, with a ſlight variation in expreſſion, though not in ſentiment:

The cauſe I have taken in hand, I am well aware, is not a *popular cause*: That *weak and temporizing Conduct*, by which many of the Cabinets of EUROPE have contributed to the ſucceſs of *French Policy*, ſeems to be the Conduct which *is judged to be best suited to the present circumstances of the Church.* The conſequence, it is to be feared, will be, that the *Deluge of Sectarianiſm* which is now inundating our Land on every ſide, will in the end ſweep away

every

every barrier which the *constitution* of this EMPIRE has to oppoſe to its deſtructive progreſs. This alarming prognoſtic however, I fear, is not likely to be liſtened to, nor a ſuitable remedy to be provided and applied at the preſent juncture: all that looſe and negligent habit of thinking, that "*wretchleſsness*," or heedleſsneſs, which is one of the peculiar and moſt fatal characteriſtics of the PRESENT AGE, "*caring for none of these things*,"—muſt prove unfavourable to the Advocates for *eſtabliſhed* Order every where. That *Miniſter and Steward of the Divine Myſteries* however, who is not prepared to go through *evil report*, has undertaken an office for which he is unqualified: *If they have called* THE MASTER OF THE HOUSE, *Beelzebub, how much more them of* HIS HOUSEHOLD? Matt. x. 24. But "NO ONE *having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the Kingdom of* GOD." Luke ix. 62.

4 OC 58

KILLESANDRA,
June 3, 1800.

FINIS.